

. (*Solanum tuberosum L.*)

**

*

Mohammed_obaid78@yahoo.com

-

*

-

**

نفذت تجربة حقلية للموسم الخريفي 2010 بزراعة البطاطا صنف Desiree في احد الحقول الخاصة في منطقة المعامير على بعد 50 كم غرب بغداد في تربة ذات نسجة مزيجة غرينية (Typic Torrifluent) واشتملت التجربة على 12 معاملة تداخل فيها ثلاثة عوامل هي الرش الورقي بحامض الفولفك المستخلص من خث تبين الحنطة بالتراكيز 0، 100، 200 ملغم/لتر-1 ورمز لها (F0 ، F1 ، F2) على التوالي بثلاث مراحل للنمو والتسميد الأرضي للبيوتاسيوم بمستويين 0 و 400 كغم. هـ- 1 ورمز لها (KL0) (KL1) على التوالي والرش بعنصر البوتاسيوم بالتراكيز 0 ، 3000 ملغم/لتر-1 ورمز لها (KS0) (KS1) تحت نظام الري بالتنقيط الشريطي ، نفذت التجربة باستخدام تصميم القطاعات العشوائية المنشقة مرتين وبثلاثة مكررات، أخذت نماذج من الأوراق والدرنات لتقدير محتواها من البيوتاسيوم كما تم قياس بعض صفات النمو الخضري والحاصل. وبينت النتائج ان المعاملة F1*KS1*KL1 حققت أفضل تركيز للبيوتاسيوم في الأوراق والدرنات (3.89%) (2.23%) على التوالي وحققت المعاملة F2*KS1*KL0 أعلى عدد للسيقان الهوائية (5.70 ساق/نبات-1) بينما حققت المعاملة F2*KS1*KL1 أعلى ارتفاع لنبات البطاطا (71.50 سم) وأعلى وزن جاف للمجموع الخضري (6094 كغم. هـ-1) وأعلى حاصل للدرنات (45.0 طن.هـ-1) بينت النتائج ان المعاملتين F2*KS1*KL1 و F1*KS1*KL1 حققتا أفضل نسب مئوية للبيوتاسيوم في الأوراق والدرنات وحققتا أفضل حاصل للدرنات وهذا يؤكد أهمية التسميد بالبيوتاسيوم والرش بحامض الفولفك وان الاختلاف في نتائج مستويي إضافة حامض الفولفك يشير إلى أن المستوى 200 ملغم/لتر-1 هو المستوى الأفضل تحت ظروف الدراسة الحالية.

(2003 pettit)
)

. (1997 Ayuso

(2003 pettit)

. 2011 / 10 / 3

. 2011 / 12 / 22

(1987)
 (1988)
 % 4- 0.1
 (1982 Kirkby Mengel)
 . (2000)
)
 .(2001

(1999)

C

B

%70

(2006)

:

.1

.2

50

2010

.(1975) Soil survey staff
 Split _ Split With R.C.B.D

" Typic Torrifuvent

Gen Static

.¹⁻ .K 400 0
 .¹⁻ .K 3000 0
 .¹⁻ . 200 100 0

3

36=3x3x2x2

1

0.8

3.2

(30-0)

. (1) (1982) page

(1965, Black)

10 .(2010

) (A)

()

1 × 2 × 1.5

(P %22) ()

% 0.5

%5

(N%46)

%1.5

()

1:21)

:

)

(160)

(

(2)

(compost

(3)

(1982)

Page

.1

| | | |
|------|-------|----|
| pH | 7.5 | |
| 1- . | 2.5 | EC |
| 1- . | 24.2 | |
| 1- . | 5.3 | |
| | 235.8 | |
| 1- . | 10.63 | |
| | 7.13 | |
| | 6.31 | |
| | 9.28 | |
| | 5.31 | |
| | Nil | |
| 1- . | 102.2 | |
| | 26.0 | |
| | 168.7 | |
| 1- . | 190 | |
| | 228 | |
| | 582 | |
| SiL | | |

.2

| | | |
|-------|----|---|
| | | |
| 7.8 | | |
| 4.3 | 1- | |
| 445.6 | 1- | |
| 20.9 | 1- | |
| 21.3 | | / |
| 0.9 | 1- | |
| 4.1 | 1- | |
| 9.3 | % | |
| 6.9 | % | |

.3

| | | |
|----|-------|--|
| | | |
| 1- | 2.1 | |
| 1- | 59.5 | |
| | 133.7 | |
| | 78.4 | |
| | 466.0 | |

Desiree
 240) (2006) (N % 46) (NH₂)₂CO
 14 120
 2010 14
 400 1- .P 120
 .K 400 1- .N 240
 (%10) (% 49)
 %100

6

() 60 (K₂O %52)
 K₂SO₄

) 80

:

(

:()

.(1- .)

.(1- .)

° 65

(1- .)

15

1-

/

X

x

=

() 0.5

Flame

(1989)

.Photometry

(4)

(2006)

.(2007)

Kumar

(70.05) F2 (65.69) F1

(58.61) F0

%19.5 %12.1

(2003 Kulikova)

.(2003 petit 1971 Schniter Poapst)

1990 Aviad Chen)

(4)

(71.08) F2*KL1

.(57.80)

F0*KL0

%23.0

(70.33)

F2*KS1

F0*KS0

%20.5

. (58.35)

F2*KS1*KL1

.F0*KS0*KL0

%24.8

(71.50)

. (57.30)

.4

.()

| x | 1- .) | | | KS0 | KL0 |
|-------|--------|-------|-------|------------|-----|
| | F2 | F1 | F0 | | |
| 63.73 | 68.30 | 65.03 | 57.30 | KS0 | KL0 |
| 63.94 | 69.17 | 64.37 | 58.30 | KS1 | |
| 65.48 | 70.67 | 66.37 | 59.40 | KS0 | KL1 |
| 65.98 | 71.50 | 67.00 | 59.43 | KS1 | |
| N.S | 4.196 | | | LSD (0.05) | |
| 63.84 | 69.02 | 64.70 | 57.80 | KL0 | x |
| 65.73 | 71.08 | 66.68 | 59.42 | KL1 | |
| N.S | 3.196 | | | LSD (0.05) | |
| 64.61 | 69.77 | 65.70 | 58.35 | KS0 | x |
| 64.96 | 70.33 | 65.68 | 58.87 | KS1 | |
| N.S | 2.873 | | | LSD (0.05) | |
| | 70.05 | 65.69 | 58.61 | | |
| | 2.191 | | | LSD (0.05) | |

(5)

(2007)

Kumar (1992) Cutter

%19.3 %9.7

(¹⁻ . 5.63) F2 (¹⁻ . 5.18) F1

.(¹⁻ . 4.72) F0

F2*KL1

F2*KL0

% 20.6 (1- . 4.70) F2*KL0
 F0*KL0
 5.65 F2*KS1 F2*KS0
 F0*KS0 % 21.5 (1- .)
 .(1- . 4.65)
 (1- . 5.73) F2*KS1*KL0
 4 .60) F0*KS0*KL1 % 24.6
 .(1- .
 .5
 .(1- .)

| x | (1- .) | | | KS0 | KL0 |
|------|----------|------|------|------------|-----|
| | F2 | F1 | F0 | | |
| 5.16 | 5.63 | 5.23 | 4.60 | KS0 | KL0 |
| 5.19 | 5.73 | 5.03 | 4.80 | KS1 | |
| 5.23 | 5.67 | 5.33 | 4.70 | KS0 | KL1 |
| 5.12 | 5.50 | 5.10 | 4.77 | KS1 | |
| N.S | 0.559 | | | LSD (0.05) | |
| 5.17 | 5.68 | 5.13 | 4.70 | KL0 | x |
| 5.18 | 5.58 | 5.22 | 4.73 | KL1 | |
| N.S | 0.383 | | | LSD (0.05) | |
| 5.19 | 5.65 | 5.28 | 4.65 | KS0 | x |
| 5.17 | 5.62 | 5.07 | 4.78 | KS1 | |
| N.S | 0.411 | | | LSD (0.05) | |
| | 5.63 | 5.18 | 4.72 | | |
| | 0.322 | | | LSD (0.05) | |

(6)

(1- . 5565) KL1
 .(1- . 5446) %2.2

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
| 6020) F2 (1- 4716) F0 | 5780) F1 | %27.7 | %22.6 | (1- (1- (4) |
| | | (5) | | |
| | (1- 5583) (1- 5445) | | KS1*KL1 KS0*KL0 | %2.5 |
| F2*KL0 (1- 6055) F2*KL1 F0*KL0 | | | F2*KL1 | % 30.3 (1- 4648) |
| 27.7 | F2*KS0 (1- 6024) | | F0*KS1 | F2*KS1 % (1- 4714) |
| | F2*KS0*KL1 .F0*KS0*KL0 | %31.5 (1- 4633) | | (1- 6094) |

.6

(1- .)

| x | (1- .) | | | | |
|-------|----------|------|------|------------|-----|
| | F2 | F1 | F0 | | |
| 5445 | 6031 | 5670 | 4633 | KS0 | KL0 |
| 5447 | 5940 | 5739 | 4662 | KS1 | |
| 5546 | 6017 | 5827 | 4795 | KS0 | KL1 |
| 5583 | 6094 | 5884 | 4772 | KS1 | |
| 103.2 | 254.0 | | | LSD (0.05) | |
| 5446 | 5986 | 5704 | 4648 | KL0 | x |
| 5565 | 6055 | 5855 | 4784 | KL1 | |
| 78.9 | 174.6 | | | LSD (0.05) | |
| 5495 | 6024 | 5748 | 4714 | KS0 | x |
| 5515 | 6017 | 5811 | 4717 | KS1 | |
| N.S | 185.5 | | | LSD (0.05) | |
| | 6020 | 5780 | 4716 | | |
| | 148.4 | | | LSD (0.05) | |

(%)

(7)

% 21.7

(% 3.82)

KL1

.(% 3.14) KL0

Chapman

(6)

.(2001)

(1992)

(F2)

(F0)

% 9.7

(% 3.62)

(% 3.30)

Chen

.(1990) Aviad

KS1*KL1
 KS0 * KL0 (% 3.87)
 .% 29.0 (% 3.00)
 (% 3.85) F2*KL1
 % 36.5 (% 3.84) F1*KL1
 (%2.82) F0*KL0
 (% 3.68) F2*KS1
 % 16.5 (% 3.61) F1*KS1
 F0*KS0
 .(% 3.16)
 F1*KS1*KL1
 % 49.0 F2*KS1*KL1 (% 3.89)
 (% 2.61) F0*KS0*KL0
 .7

| x | (1- .) | | | | |
|-------|---------|------|------|------------|-----|
| | F2 | F1 | F0 | | |
| 3.00 | 3.30 | 3.11 | 2.61 | KS0 | KL0 |
| 3.28 | 3.47 | 3.33 | 3.04 | KS1 | |
| 3.77 | 3.81 | 3.79 | 3.71 | KS0 | KL1 |
| 3.87 | 3.88 | 3.89 | 3.83 | KS1 | |
| 0.373 | 0.427 | | | LSD (0.05) | |
| | | | | | |
| 3.14 | 3.38 | 3.22 | 2.82 | KL0 | x |
| 3.82 | 3.85 | 3.84 | 3.77 | KL1 | |
| 0.165 | 0.405 | | | LSD (0.05) | |
| | | | | | |
| 3.39 | 3.56 | 3.45 | 3.16 | KS0 | x |
| 3.57 | 3.68 | 3.61 | 3.44 | KS1 | |
| N.S | 0.405 | | | LSD (0.05) | |
| | 3.62 | 3.53 | 3.30 | | |
| | 0.292 | | | LSD (0.05) | |

| | | | | |
|----------|-------------|----------|---------|-------------|
| | | | (8) | (%) |
| | (% 2.22) | KL1 | | |
| 1.92) | | | | %15.6 |
| | | | | (8) .(%) |
| % 6.0 | (% 2.13) | KS1 | | |
| (% 2.01) | | | | KS0 |
| | | | (2010) | (2007) |
| | | KS1*KL1 | | |
| %23.3 | | KS0*KL1 | | (% 2.22) |
| | | (% 1.80) | | KS0*KL1 |
| * KL1 | F1*KL1 | | | |
| | | F01*KL1 | | (%2.22) F2 |
| | | F0*KL0 | | %18.7 |
| | | | | (%1.87) |
| | F2*KS1 | | | |
| 7.5 | | F1*KS1 | | (% 2.16) |
| | | | | F0*KS0 % |
| | | | | (% 2.01) |
| | F2*KS1 *KL1 | | | |
| % 23.2 | | (% 2.23) | | F1*KS1 *KL1 |
| | | (% 1.81) | | F0*KS0*KL0 |

.8

| x | (1- .) | | | | |
|-------|---------|------|------|------------|-----|
| | F2 | F1 | F0 | | |
| 1.80 | 1.84 | 1.75 | 1.81 | KS0 | KL0 |
| 2.04 | 2.09 | 2.08 | 1.94 | KS1 | |
| 2.22 | 2.22 | 2.22 | 2.21 | KS0 | KL1 |
| 2.22 | 2.23 | 2.23 | 2.21 | KS1 | |
| 0.091 | 0.156 | | | LSD (0.05) | |
| | | | | | |
| 1.92 | 1.96 | 1.92 | 1.87 | KL0 | x |
| 2.22 | 2.22 | 2.22 | 2.21 | KL1 | |
| 0.021 | 0.101 | | | LSD (0.05) | |
| | | | | | |
| 2.01 | 2.03 | 1.99 | 2.01 | KS0 | x |
| 2.13 | 2.16 | 2.15 | 2.08 | KS1 | |
| 0.092 | 0.021 | | | LSD (0.05) | |
| | 2.09 | 2.07 | 2.04 | | |
| | N.S | | | LSD (0.05) | |

(9)
 %11.9 (1- . 42.81) KL1
 (9) .(1- . 38.26) KL0
 % 6.2 (1- . 41.74) KS1
 .(1- . 39.32)

Havlin)

(2005
Starch synthetase

| | | | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| | (1982 Kirkby Mengel) | | | |
| | | (2007) | | |
|) F1 | %10.8 %7.7 | (¹⁻ . 42.30) F2 | (¹⁻ . 41.12 | |
| | | (¹⁻ . 38.17) F0 | | |
| (5) | | (4) | | |
| | | (6) | | |
| | (2005) Khang | (1988) | Dunstone | |
|) | KS1*KL1 | | | |
| 36.42) | | KS0*KL0 | (¹⁻ . 43.39 | |
| | | . %19.1 | (¹⁻ . | |
| | (¹⁻ . 44.48) F2*KL1 | | | |
| | F0*KL0 | % 23.5 | | |
| | . F1*KL1 | (¹⁻ . 36.03) | | |
| | (¹⁻ . 43.38) | F2*KS1 | | |
| | | F0*KS1 | %16.9 | |
| | | | (¹⁻ . 37.12) | |
| | F2*KS1*KL1 | | | |
| 30.2 | F1 *KS1*KL1 | | (¹⁻ . 44.97) | |
| (¹⁻ . 34.53) | | .F0*KS0*KL0 | % | |
| ¹⁻ . 100 | | | | |
| - . 400 | | ¹⁻ . 3000 | | |
| | | | | 1 |
| | ¹⁻ . 100 | | Desiree | |

.9

.(¹⁻ .)

| x | | | | | |
|-------|-------|-------|-------|------------|-----|
| | F 2 | F 1 | F 0 | | |
| 36.42 | 38.43 | 36.30 | 34.53 | KS0 | KL0 |
| 41.10 | 41.80 | 40.97 | 37.53 | KS1 | |
| 42.22 | 44.00 | 42.97 | 39.70 | KS0 | KL1 |
| 43.39 | 44.97 | 44.27 | 40.93 | KS1 | |
| 2.211 | 2.355 | | | LSD (0.05) | |
| | | | | | |
| 38.26 | 40.12 | 38.63 | 36.03 | KL0 | x |
| 42.81 | 44.48 | 43.62 | 40.32 | KL1 | |
| 2.523 | 1.997 | | | LSD (0.05) | |
| | | | | | |
| 39.32 | 41.22 | 39.63 | 37.12 | KS0 | x |
| 41.74 | 43.38 | 42.62 | 39.23 | KS1 | |
| 0.528 | 1.415 | | | LSD (0.05) | |
| | 42.30 | 41.12 | 38.17 | | |
| | 1.179 | | | LSD (0.05) | |

. 2006.

. 2006 .

.66-57 :(6)37

. 2010 .

. 2000.

. 25 -15 : (11)

.1989.

.2010.

Solanum

137: (1) 8:

tuberosum L

.145

NPK

. 2006.

. 2001.

.1999 .

.2007 .

Solanum tuberosum L.

. 1987.

- Ayuso, M., J. L. Moreno, T. Hernadz, and C.Grcia.1997.Characterisation and evaluation of humic acid extracted from urban waste as liquid fertilizers. *J.Sci food Agric*.75:481-488.
- Black, C. A. 1965. Methods of Soil Analysis. Am. Soc. Agron. No. 9 Part 1. Madison, Wisconsin. USA
- Chapman, K. S. R.; L. A. Sparrow, P. R. Handman, D. N. Wright, and I. R.A. Thorp. 1992. Potassium nutrition of Kennebec and russet Burbank potatoes in Tasmania: Effect of soil and fertilizer potassium on yield petiole and tuber potassium concentrations and tuber quality. *Australian Journal of Experimental Agriculture*.32(4)521-527
- Chen, Y. and T. Aviad . 1990.Effect of humic substance on plant growth .In P.T MacCarthy et al (.Eds). Humic substances in soil and crop sciences: selected readings. *Amer. Soc .of Agron*.161-186.
- Cutter, E. G. 1992. Structure and development of the potato plant. In: Harris, P. M. (ed). The potato crop 2nd edn. Chapman and Hall, London, pp. 65-161
- Dunstone, R. R.; Richards and H. M. Rawson. 1988. Variable responses of stomatal conductance, growth, and yield to fulvic acid applications to wheat.*Australian Journal of Agricultural Research* 39(4):547-553
- Khang,V. Tien.2011. Fulvic foliar fertilizer impact on growth of rice and radish at first stage. *Omonrice Journal* 18:144-148.
- Kulikova, N. A., Dashitsyrenova, A. D., Perminova, I. V. and Lebedeva G.F.2003. Auxin-like activity of different fractions of coal humic acids, *Bulgarian J. Ecolog. Sci*. 2(3-4), 55-56.
- Kumar, parveen and S. K. pandey., B. P. Singh., S. V. S. Dinesh, 2007 . influence of source and time of potassium application on Potato growth,yield economics and crisp quality.*potato Research* 50:1-13.

- Mengel, K. and E. Kirkby . 1982. Principles of plant nutrition. 3rd. ed. Int. Potash Instiute Bern, Switzerland.
- Page,A,L.,R.H Miller and D.R. Keeney (Eds) 1982. Methods of soil analysis.Part2.2nd edition.Chemical & Microbiological properties . Am .Soc .of Agr.,S.S.S.Am.Inc.,Madison, Wisconson, USA.
- Pettit, Robert E. 2003. Emeritus Associate Professor Texas A & M university, Organic Matter, Humus, Humates Humic Acid, Fulvic Acid and Humin: Their Importance in Soil Fertility and Plant Health. <Mhtml;file;/ORGNIC MATTER.mht>.
- Poapst, P. A. and M. Schniter, 1971. Fulvic acid and adventitious root formation.*Soil Biology and Biochemistry*,3,215-219.

EFFECT OF DIFFERENT RATE OF FOLIAR APPLIED FULVIC ACID RATE AND POTASSIUM APPLICATIONS ON GROWTH AND YIELD OF POTATO (*Solanum tubersum L.*)

Mohammed.O. AL-Jumally*

Abul whab. A. AL-Jumally**

*College of agriculture- Anbar Univ.

Mohammed_ obaid78 @yahoo.com

** College of agriculture- Baghdad Univ.

ABSTRACT

A field experiment was conducted during Autumn season 2010 using potato tubers of Desiree in private filed in Al-Maimer region ,50 Km west of Baghdad in a silty loam texture soil Typic Torrifluvent. The study involve 12 integrated treatment, foliar application with fulvic acid (extracted from wheat straw compost) at the concentration 0,100,200 mgk. L⁻¹ have the symbol (F0, F1, F2) respectively at three plant stages and land potassium fertilization 0 , 400 kgk. ha⁻¹ have the symbol (KL0, KL1) respectively and spraying with potassium at the concentration 0,3000, mg. L⁻¹ have the symbol (KS0,KS1) respectively under Tape drip irrigation. Spilt-Spilt plot Design was adopted with three replicates. Samples were taken from leafs and tubers to determine their content from potassium and some of growth properties and yield were measured .the results showed superiority the treatment F1*KS1*KL1 by giving higher potassium concentration in leaf (3.89%) and the same treatment give higher potassium concentration in tuber (2.23%) , whereas the treatment F2* KS1*KL1 had higher number of steam per plant (5.70 steam .plant-1) while the treatment F2* KS1 *KL1 gave higher potato plant height (71.50 cm) and the same treatment give greater dry weight for leaf (6094 kg. h⁻¹) and higher tuber yield (44.97 ton.ha⁻¹). and this confirm the importance of potassium fertilization and fulvic acid foliar application, the no difference between fulvic acids levels refers to the level 100 mg. L⁻¹ fulvic was the best level under reiging study condition

key words: Fulvic acid, Potassium, Foliar application, Potato